Atrial Fibrillation Device Therapies

Stuart Portnoy Marian Kroen
Dina Fleischer Doris Terry
Pacing and Electrophysiology Devices Branch
Division of Cardiovascular and Respiratory Devices

	0908	.00	MPR -7	A9:37	
					
		·			
				·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
_	·				

Overview

- AF Clinical Facts
- · AF Device Therapies
- July 1998 Panel Meeting
- Definitions of Success
- . Clinical Trial Designs
- Questions for the Panel
 - Pacemakers and Implantable Atrial Defibrillators
 - Catheter Ablation Systems

Atrial Fibrillation (AF)

- Most common chronic tachycardia
- Most common cardiac cause of stroke
- ~ 6% of US population > 60 years have AF
- Incidence increases with 1 age
- Significant public health concern

	<u> </u>	 	
<u> </u>		 	

AF Device Therapies

- Pacemakers
- Implantable Atrial Defibrillators
- Catheter Ablation Systems
 - Linear Ablation (MAZE)
 - Focal Pulmonary Vein (PV) Ablation

Previous Panel Considerations

- <u>July 1998</u> Panel made recommendations regarding AF Ablation clinical trial design
- Today Broaden to include discussion of Pacemakers and Atrial Defibrillators

Definitions of Success

- AF Ablation Definitions of acute and chronic success are well-characterized in medical literature.
- Pacemakers & Atrial Defibrillators -Success criteria are not as well-defined.
- What are clinically meaningful measures of device effectiveness?

Clinical Trial Designs • Randomized - Treatment vs. Control • Crossover - Treatment ON vs. OFF • Baseline - Baseline Observation Period Followed by Treatment Period **Questions for the Panel** Pacemakers and Implantable Atrial **Defibrillators**

Study Design
Pacemakers and Implantable Atrial Defibrillators

- 1. Discuss study design options below first for pacemakers, and then for implantable atrial defibrillators.
 - a. Randomized Controlled Study
 - b. Single-Arm Crossover Study
 - c. Single-Arm Prospective Baseline . Period

Study Endpoints Pacemakers and Implantable Atrial Defibrillators

- 2. Discuss whether reduction in occurrence of:
 - a) symptomatic, or
 - b) symptomatic + asymptomatic episodes

would be considered clinically relevant in demonstrating effectiveness of AF pacing therapies.

Study Endpoints
Pacemakers and Implantable Atrial Defibrillators

- 3. How should "burden" be defined?
 - a. Time spent in AF, AT, and/or AT/AF
 - b. Days in which a patient has at least one AT/AF episode
 - c. Other

Study Endpoints	
Pacemakers and Implantable Atrial Defibrillators	
For implantable atrial defibrillators, is atrial shock therapy effectiveness best measured by	
the ability to terminate AF/AT episodes?	
What other endpoints do you think might be appropriate?	
a	
]
Success Criteria	
Pacemakers and Implantable Atrial Defibrillators	
Discuss whether your expectation for a clinically-relevant percent reduction in AF	
episodes would be altered by the risk- benefit profile for pacing therapy.	
n	
	•
O that we All latter to the same	
Catheter Ablation Systems	
72	

O the state of the planty was presented by the process of the proc

Catheter Ablation Systems Study Design

- Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of the following study designs:
 - a. Randomized Controlled Study
 - b. Single-Arm Prospective Baseline Study
 - c. Single-Arm Retrospective Baseline Study
 - d. Other

Catheter Ablation Systems

Inclusion Criteria

- 2. What inclusion criteria may be reliably used to identify patients in whom AF is believed to originate in the PVs?
 - patients with monomorphic and/or inferiorly directed premature atrial contractions (PACs)
 - b. patients with ectopic foci mapped during electrophysiologic study to the PVs
 - c. patients with a history of paroxysmal AF
 - d. other

Catheter Ablation Systems

Identification of Target Ablation Sites

3. If a patient is not in AF at the time of the PV ablation procedure, and if the patient is also non-inducible for AF, can you recommend what electrophysiological criteria investigators might use in identifying which PV(s) to ablate?

Catheter Ablation Systems

Acute Success

- Which reliable physiologic criteria might be used to evaluate the acute success of the PV ablation procedure?
 - a, post-ablation non-inducibility
 - b. loss of atrial capture
 - c. decrease in atrial electrogram amplitude
 - d. measurement of "electrical isolation" of the abated PV (how would you evaluate this electrophysiological parameter?)
 - e. Other

Catheter Ablation Systems

Success Criteria

 In July 1998, the Circulatory System Devices Panel suggested that 50-75% reduction in frequency of AF episodes would be a clinically relevant reduction for linear ablation procedures.

Please discuss whether your expectation has changed for this endpoint, given the increased use of RF ablation as a treatment modality.

Catheter Ablation Systems

PV Thrombosis and Pulmonary HTN

6. Recent articles in the medial literature suggest that some patients may experience pulmonary vein thrombosis as a result of the PV ablation procedure. Is there a relatively low risk (i.e., minimally invasive) method for evaluating PV thrombosis during the early post-ablation period? Patients may also develop pulmonary hypertension. Likewise, is there a relatively low risk method for evaluating pulmonary hypertension during the follow-up period?